

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) ANTITRUST
LITIGATION

No. M 07-1827 SI
MDL No. 1827

This Order Relates To:

P.C. RICHARD & SON LONG ISLAND
CORPORATION, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. C 11-4119 SI

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING
PLAINTIFFS TO SERVE DEFENDANT
CHUNGHWA PICTURE TUBES, LTD.
THROUGH ITS U.S. COUNSEL**

Plaintiffs have filed a motion to serve a foreign defendant, Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd., through its U.S. counsel pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3). The Court has previously heard and granted a number of similar motions in this MDL. *See, e.g.*, Order Re: Defendant Nexgen MediaTech Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss for Insufficient Service of Process; Quashing Service; and Granting Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Motion to Serve Nexgen Through its Counsel Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3), Nov. 19, 2008 (Master Docket No. 725); *see also* Master Docket Nos. 1309, 1657, 1779, 2109, 2532, 2584, 2747, 2748, 2825, 3079, 3217, 3345, 3394, 3443. Chunghwa has opposed these motions to preserve its objections to this manner of service, but has recognized this Court's inclination to permit service through its U.S. counsel.

Given the number of these motions, the Court is well acquainted with the content of Chunghwa's

1 opposition.¹ In order to save Chunghwa the time and expense of filing another opposition brief, the
2 Court rules as follows:

3 For the reasons set forth in its prior orders, the Court finds that service under Rule 4(f)(3) is both
4 available to plaintiff and appropriate in this case. *See, e.g., Rio Properties, Inc. v. Rio Intern. Interlink*,
5 284 F.3d 1007, 1014-15 (9th Cir. 2002) (holding that service of process under Rule 4(f)(3) is not a “last
6 resort,” but “merely one means among several which enables service of process on an international
7 defendant”). Further, due to Chunghwa’s active participation in this MDL for the past three years, the
8 Court finds that service through its U.S. counsel will fully comport with due process. *See FMAC Loan*
9 *Receivables v. Dagra*, 228 F.R.D. 531, 534 (E.D. Va. 2005) (finding service on defendant through his
10 attorney complied with due process because the numerous motions filed by defendant’s attorney made
11 it “abundantly clear” that the two had been in constant communication).

12 Absent further objection from Chunghwa, plaintiffs may serve Chunghwa through its U.S.
13 counsel after October 14, 2011. If Chunghwa has a specific objection not already addressed by the
14 prior orders of this Court, it may file an opposition before that date.

15
16 **CONCLUSION**

17 For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown, the Court hereby GRANTS plaintiffs’
18 motion to serve Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd. through its U.S. counsel pursuant to Federal Rule of
19 Civil Procedure 4(f)(3). Docket No. 13 in 11-4119; Docket No. 3609 in 07-1827. Absent objection
20 from Chunghwa, plaintiffs may serve Chunghwa through counsel after October 14, 2011.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 Dated: September 22, 2011


SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

23
24
25
26
27 ¹Specifically, Chunghwa’s opposition briefs have argued 1) that plaintiffs have not met the
28 requirements for invoking alternative service under Rule 4(f)(3); and 2) that service through its U.S.
counsel violates due process.